



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,411	10/04/2007	Reuben Hoppenstein	HOP07.019	2511
63973 7590 11/06/2008				
KEITH D. NOWAK				
CARTER LEDYARD & MILBURN LLP				
2 WALL STREET				
NEW YORK, NY 10005				
EXAMINER				
SOTELO, JESUS D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,411

Applicant(s)

HOPPENSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

JESUS D. SOTELO

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/16/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are in the application.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, 16 and 17, drawn to an amphibious vehicle, classified in class 440, subclass 12.69.
 - II. Claims 14 and 15, drawn to a method of changing tires, classified in class 301, subclass 36.1.
3. Inventions I and II are directed to related inventions. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
4. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Keith D. Nowak on 10/28/2008 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13, 16, and 17. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14 and 15 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the arrangement of claim 10 and the solar panels and electric motor of claim 13, and the arrangement of claim 17 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1-13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With reference to claims 1 and 16, the recitation “an extendable frame” is unclear. The frame shown in the figures does not indicate any “extendability”.

9. With reference to claims 5 and 16, it is not clear how the two wheels with spokes or the water jets generate propulsion. For this to happen, the vehicle must have some form of flotation means, otherwise the vehicle will sink to the bottom of the body of water and the paddle wheels or jets would serve no purpose. With reference to claims 6 and 7, the configuration of the baffle and conical nozzle is not clear. Similarly, with reference to claims 10 and 13, the structure disclosed therein should be properly disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claim 1 (as best understood) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thuliez (6,015,022).

Thuliez discloses a self propelled conveyance comprising a frame that can be extended to any desired length and having an inner and outer perimeters and a floor pan attached to the frame; a driver seat is disposed on a front to back center line of the conveyance; a pair of front wheels 17, 18 are attached to the frame; the front wheel extend beyond the outer perimeter of the frame; and a rear wheel assembly including at least one wheel 15 extending beyond the outer perimeter of the frame.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thuliez (6,015,022) in view of Murray (5,538,309).

Murray discloses a vehicle body and teaches arranging the seats with a front driver seat centrally located and a pair of passenger seats disposed behind the driver seat and each passenger seat being offset from the front to back center line of the vehicle. In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the vehicle of Thuliez with passenger seats in an arrangement as taught by Murray. The addition of passenger seats

would have been desirable and an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art. In Thuliez the tires are conventional pneumatic tires and in a collision would absorb some of the shock from the collision.

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thuliez (6,015,022) in view of Kejha (7,036,616).

Kejha discloses a vehicle with two wheels widely separated on the front of the vehicle and at the rear, the vehicle is provided with two wheels separated by a short distance. In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the rear wheel in Thuliez with two closely secured wheels in an arrangement as taught by Kejha. The provision of two wheels would have been desirable for better support and as a safety provision in the event one wheels was to become flat.

15. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thuliez (6,015,022) in view of Murray (5,538,309) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Costa (2,363,573).

Costa discloses a vehicle and teaches providing the same a steel eye on the upper portion of the vehicle for hoisting. In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the vehicle of Thuliez with a hoisting hook on the roof, generally as taught by Costa. The hoisting hook would have been desirable to transfer the vehicle from one location to another.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESUS D. SOTELO whose telephone number is 571-272-6686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 7:00 AM -4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samuel J. Morano can be reached on 571-272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JESUS D. SOTELO/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3617

6 November 2008